



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

illicit amour, typified by the Dido incident. Yielding himself to this, he is eventually warned by the intelligence, represented by Mercury, when he abandons his base passion, which being forgotten flickers away to ashes, represented by the death and the funeral pyre of Dido. Inspired by the memory of his father (Book 5), Aeneas devotes himself to manly pursuits, represented by the funeral games of Anchises. The boxing-match between Entellus and Dares signifies the pursuit of truth. The burning of the ships symbolizes the action of the reasoning mind in rising superior to material considerations and destroying the means of further wandering.

In Book 6 Aeneas comes to the temple of Apollo and descends to the lower regions, where Apollo represents the god of the mind. First Aeneas is freed from false opinion, typified by the loss of Palinurus (*Palinurus enim quasi planonorus, id est errabunda visio*), and from vainglory, symbolized in the burial of Misenus, for *misio* in Greek means 'hate', and *enos* means 'praise'. Thus purified, he procures the golden bough, which is the wisdom which lays open all hidden knowledge, and he undertakes philosophical studies, i. e. the descent into Hades. Vergil here refers to the ancient legend that his mother had dreamed of having given birth to a bough, and establishes this as the reason for making the bough play such a prominent rôle. On entering the lower regions the young man sees first the cares of life. Then led by Charon, who is time, he crosses the boiling tide of youth (Acheron), and hears the dissensions of men (the barking of Cerberus), which are soothed and quieted by the honey of wisdom (the sop to Cerberus). In the lower world he sees Dido, typifying the remembrance of youthful folly; and comes to a knowledge of good and evil, represented by the punishments inflicted upon the wrongdoers. He enters the Elysian fields, symbolizing the freedom of life after the regulations imposed in childhood by those in authority, and sees his father Anchises, and the river Lethe, the first representing the dignity of manhood, the second the forgetting of youthful folly.

In Book 7 Aeneas frees himself from all supervision (burial of the nurse Caieta), and reaches Ausonia, that is, increase of good, for which the desires of all men are eager, and seeks as his wife Lavinia, that is, the path of labor. In Book 8 he seeks the help of Euander, for Euander in Greek signifies 'good man', and from him learns of the conquest of virtue over vice, represented by the story of Hercules and Cacus. In the remaining four books Aeneas girds himself with all the Roman virtues (the arms of Vulcan), and joins battle with Turnus (anger), whose allies are Mezentius (impiety), Messapus (folly), Iuturna (obstinacy), and Metiscus (drunkenness). Finally Wisdom and Virtue are triumphant.

The whole of this work of Fulgentius is a distorted product of misapplied industry. It is loaded with the wildest etymologies, of which those quoted are typical examples. In one passage the author wanders so far from actualities as to make Vergil quote Petronius. There is no order or balance in the arrangement of material; several pages are devoted to the elucidation of

a few phrases, while whole books are passed over in a few words. Not infrequently the course of the exposition is broken by long digressions; in one place the argument becomes so confused that Vergil is made to speak as though he were Fulgentius. It is noteworthy that most detail is lavished upon Book 6, in conformity with the superstition that this book contained more hidden wisdom than any other. Servius had given expression to this view in the note prefixed to the book:

All Vergil is full of wisdom, in which respect this book, a large part of which is taken from Homer, holds the chief place. In it there are some things stated simply, many are taken from history, and many others from the profound sciences of Egyptian philosophy and theology, so that people have written whole dissertations on individual passages in it'.

The Vergil of Fulgentius is different in his delineation from that of any previous writer. The early biographers of Vergil have represented him as a genial person, modest and retiring, dear to his friends, and shunning publicity. The Vergil of Fulgentius, on the other hand, is a haughty, cold, and arrogant spirit, a mystic, possessing a vast fund of weird and unholy knowledge. Here we have the first indication in Christian Latin of the regular medieval type of wise man, who in his demeanor and character partakes of the darkness in which all knowledge is shrouded. Learning had become so rare that its possession was an occult attribute; the scholar was not to be distinguished from the warlock who held unholy communion with spirits, and gained his wisdom through his control over the mysterious forces of nature.

The Vergil of Fulgentius may be considered a logical development of tendencies which may be noticed elsewhere in the Christian writers. The very earliest of the patristic authors looked upon Vergil primarily as a literary figure; the classical age was too near for them to do otherwise. After this the tradition gradually developed; Vergil was esteemed an authority on questions of all sorts. This culminated in writing of the type of Macrobius, where the most extraordinary powers are claimed for him. The Vergil of Fulgentius is really no more than the logical extension of the same view with the superimposition of the mystic elements demanded by the taste of the period.

UNION COLLEGE HARRISON CADWALLADER COFFIN

REVIEWS

P. Cornelii Taciti *De Germania*. Edited by Alfred Gudeman. Berlin: Weidmann (1916). Pp. viii + 272.

Dr. Gudeman's edition of the *Germania* of Tacitus is a worthy addition to the Weidmann series of annotated Classics, including such excellent volumes as the Weissenborn-Müller *Livy*, the Kiessling-Heinze *Horace*, and Kroll's edition of the *Orator* of Cicero. It is based largely on his American edition of the *Germania*, published in 1900 by Allyn and Bacon, though this has been extensively revised and enlarged.

The extensive introduction (49 pages) takes up the same topics as the American edition: the origin and the purpose of the *Germania*, the sources, trustworthiness, style. In the discussion of the purpose of the *Germania*, Dr. Gudeman adds two new points in criticism of the theory that the work was written purely as a satire on degenerate Rome in contrast to virile Germany. The two points, which are somewhat inconsistent, are that Tacitus is not blind to the faults of the Germans, and that he was forced to praise the Germans because the description of a people, as of an individual, belonged to encomiastic literature. As before, Dr. Gudeman rejects also the theory that the work is a political pamphlet and concludes that it is a by-product of Tacitus's historical studies.

In dealing with the sources the editor follows his former procedure of rejecting various works and decides that the important sources are Livy, Pliny's *Bella Germaniae*, and Posidonius. Besides, Tacitus got information, he believes, from persons who had first-hand knowledge of the country, though he himself had no personal acquaintance with it. He also used a map. In these conclusions there are certain divergences from the earlier edition. In this he had said of Livy: ". . . any direct indebtedness to this historian is, to say the least, not intrinsically plausible"; now he includes Livy among the sources. His argument is very flimsy—but it must be said that he puts it forward very cautiously. In the *Germania*, Chapter 3, Tacitus says, *quae neque confirmare argumentis neque refellere in animo est*. As is well known, this expression is found in Livy, Praef. 6, *ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est*, and again in 5.21.9, *neque adfirmare neque refellere operae pretium est*. Dr. Gudeman grants that Tacitus borrowed from Livy, but he argues that it is psychologically improbable that Tacitus should have remembered this particular phrase from his earlier reading of *Livius ingens*. His explanation is that Livy may have used the phrase again in his description of Germany and that Tacitus found it there. But I cannot see the psychological improbability which troubles Dr. Gudeman. Most of us recall single striking phrases from books we read years ago. And, besides, is it not entirely likely that Tacitus often reread the famous Preface of Livy?

With regard to Posidonius, Dr. Gudeman said in the English edition, ". . . it is to the highest degree probable, though not susceptible of absolute proof, that Posidonius" was one of the sources which Tacitus used in the *Germania*. In the German edition this statement is made stronger. The hypothesis can now 'scarcely be disputed', and 'is made to appear scientifically unobjectionable'. I claim no special knowledge of this subject, but it strikes me that the statement in the new edition is too strong. There has been a great wave of Posidonianism in recent years, especially among German scholars. One can achieve a reputation easily by tracing the relation of one more author, Greek or Roman, to this fountain head of wisdom!

⁷ There have been protests; in this country may be mentioned e. g. protests by Professor Knapp, in his review of Norden, P. Vergilius Maro: *Aeneis VI* (American Journal of Philology 27 [1906], 79), by Dr. Jones, in his dissertation, *The Platonism of Plutarch*,

Perhaps Dr. Gudeman is right in asserting that he depends on Tacitus on Posidonius, but the layman in such matters may be forgiven for being sceptical when he meets the name of Posidonius. He has heard the cry of 'Wolf' too often.

Dr. Gudeman argues that the identification of Germanic and Greek (Roman) gods in the *Germania* must go back to Posidonius, as the Romans were incapable of making this identification. We may answer that the history of the original Roman religion has been obscured just because the Romans were too facile in identifying their gods with those of the peoples with whom they came in contact. In *Germania* 43 Tacitus expressly calls the identification of the German twin brothers with Castor and Pollux an *interpretatio Romana*. Dr. Gudeman says this must be an *interpretatio Graeca*, because Pollux was adopted by the Romans at a relatively late date. But that date was long before the time of Posidonius.

In the matter of the trustworthiness of the *Germania*, Dr. Gudeman holds to his former opinion, that, in matters of fact, Tacitus is entirely dependable, but that, in the interpretation of facts, in the attribution of motives and feelings, he is not.

The section on style and rhetoric covers essentially the same ground in the new edition as in the old. The march of events in the last twenty years has provided the editor with a new comparison for Tacitus's famous inconcinnity: it is similar to the musical dissonances of modern composers.

It would be incorrect to say that the commentary is at the bottom of the page: rather one may say that the text is at the top, for it averages only about $\frac{1}{2}$ inch (a little over 3 lines) to the page, while the commentary takes up about $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches of smaller type. As the text is based on that of the fifth edition by Halm-Andresen (Teubner, 1915), we need not discuss it here. The 63 divergences from that edition are discussed in a critical appendix. Most of these are also found in the appendix to the English edition. Dr. Gudeman's attitude towards the newly-found Iesi manuscript is that of most German scholars (as against the Italians, Annibaldi and Sabbadini), that it is not a direct copy of the lost Hersfeldensis. Annibaldi's edition in the *Corpus Paravianum* appeared too late to be seen by Dr. Gudeman. The suggestions in the appendix include few novelties of importance. In two instances the editor prefers the reading of E (the Iesi MS.) to that of the Teubner text: 14, *virtute principem* (so also Annibaldi); 16, *imitentur* (where even Annibaldi reads *imitetur*). *Inscientia* (16), the reading of the lost Hersfeldensis, according to the Italian humanist, Decembrio, is preferred to *inscitia*, the reading of the extant MSS. Occasionally Dr. Gudeman abandons an emendation and returns to the manuscript reading: 8, *Aurini*; 28, *Germanorum natione*; 30, *ratione*

53 ff., and in his review of Gronau, *Poseidonios und die Juedisch-Christliche Genesisexegese* (Classical Philology 12 [1917], 107 ff.), by Professor Shorey, in his review of Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa* (Classical Philology 10 [1915], 483 ff.), and by Professor Robbins, *Posidonius and the Sources of Pythagorean Arithmology* (Classical Philology 15 [1920], 309 ff.).

(for *Romanae*); 42, *peragitur*. Several emendations are suggested in the appendix but not adopted in the text: 26, *versuras*; 34, *sed superesse*; 34, [*Druso*]; 36, *fracti* (for *tracti*). A new and rather plausible conjecture adopted in the text is *horrentes capilli retro sequuntur . . . religantur* (38). Dr. Gudeman makes a strong argument against the accepted readings here, but does not do justice to the manuscript reading. Another new conjecture is 3, *et apud eos* (for *apud eos et*).

The commentary, as indicated above, is very full. Like that in the American edition, it contains numerous comments on the rhetorical devices of the *Germania*. It is also particularly rich in parallels for the meanings of words and for their uses in phrases. Dr. Gudeman believes that the resemblance of the opening lines of the *Germania* (*Germania omnis a Gallis Raetisque et Pannoniis Rheno et Danuvio fluminibus, a Sarmatis Dacisque mutuo metu aut montibus separatur*) to the beginning of Caesar's Gallic War is accidental. To me it seems a deliberate imitation—with a difference. By the inconcinnity of *metu* and *montibus* Tacitus intentionally indicates the difference between his rhetorical style and Caesar's simple style.

In Chapter 5 Tacitus tells us that the Germans prefer money which is *veterem et diu notam, serratos bigatosque*. Dr. Gudeman now says that Tacitus is either exaggerating or using an early source, as few such coins (which antedate 53 B. C.) have been found in Germany. But perhaps Tacitus is using his own more vivid expression, *serratos bigatosque*, in explanation of *veterem*. An analogy for this is the expression *vinum consulare*. Dr. Gudeman does not explain why the Germans preferred old money. The answer is implicit in *diu notam*: probably the Romans worked off spurious coins on them, *ut nunc*.

In Chapter 7 Dr. Gudeman reverts to an old explanation of *hortamina* as 'liquid refreshments'. For this he finds new parallels. But the thought of the next sentence would seem to indicate that the word has the original meaning of 'encouragement'.

In the American edition Dr. Gudeman, commenting on Chapter 9, found substantiation for supposing that the Germans worshiped natural objects, like the sun and the moon, as well as other gods, in the names of the days of the week: Sunday, Monday, as against Tuesday, etc. He overlooked the fact that the days of the week were named after the planets, not the gods. The statement has been omitted in the German edition.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

B. L. ULLMAN

History of Europe. Ancient and Medieval. By James Henry Breasted and James Harvey Robinson. Boston: Ginn and Company (1920). Pp. xiii + 665.

This review is confined to that portion of the volume which is included within Books I—IV, dealing with Earliest Man, The Orient, The Greeks, and The Romans. Professor Breasted, in these Books, covers the same ground which he had covered before in his numer-

ous other publications, especially in his earlier textbooks, *Outlines of European History* (1914), and *Ancient Times* (1916—see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10. 199-200). The present volume is based on the author's *Outlines of European History*. But the material has been condensed and quite thoroughly rewritten and rearranged. Many shifts in emphasis are the result and practically all are for the better. "More space has been given to Roman history and less to that of the ancient Orient", the Introduction tells us (iv). This is an improvement; but even now too large a proportion has been allotted to that earlier civilization, as the following figures show: 64 pages to the Orient, 111 pages to the Greeks, and 100 pages to the Romans. Formerly, as a protest against the blindness of historians to the indebtedness of Greece and Rome to the ancient Orient, a little overstress was pardonable, perhaps necessary. Such blindness no longer exists; so manifestly Professor Breasted's full knowledge of, and enthusiasm for, the Oriental field have disturbed his sense of proportion. For he has been guilty of a sin which the Introduction ascribes to former textbooks on universal history: "The older books tended to give too much attention to the remote past and too little information in regard to recent history".

The extreme condensation necessary in so brief a manual makes adequate treatment of many important topics impossible. For example, there is no direct information given as to how the Delian League was transformed into an Athenian Empire, beyond the bare statement of that fact and the mention of the transferring of the treasury from Delos to Athens (131, 132, 150). The description of the battle of Leuctra, on page 160, is silent about the innovations in military science and practice which were among the chief factors in Alexander's easy conquest of Asia. Less than ten lines are devoted to the struggle of Demosthenes against Philip (170), in spite of all that contest symbolizes for every age. The story of the First Carthaginian War is told in one page. The student who uses this text-book will know nothing about the traditional 'slimness' of Roman diplomacy which precipitated the war and which helps to explain the rapid advance of Rome in the Mediterranean world. The work of the Gracchi is similarly dismissed in one page (230), which can not, and does not, give an adequate conception of the scope and of the importance of their attempted reforms. We hear nothing of the Mithridatic Wars and may well wonder what was going on in Asia Minor to call Sulla away from Rome and from his opponent Marius (234). These omissions are typical and, perhaps, unavoidable under the circumstances.

In regard to some matters of fact one might hold different opinions from those of Professor Breasted. The statement on page 95 concerning the authorship of the Homeric poems should have taken into account the very recent work done in this country on Homer. Certainly the Unitarians are having their inning to-day. On page 112 the severity of the Draconian code is affirmed without sufficient qualification; the most important laws, those dealing with homicide, were merciful